

# Pittsburgh Recorder.

UNION, THE CONSTITUTION, AND THE LAWS—THE GUARDIANS OF OUR LIBERTY.

Vol. XVII.

FRIDAY, APRIL 15, 1836.

No. 814.

## IN THE SENATE.

SPEECH OF MR. PORTER,  
(of LOUISIANA.)  
ON THE EXPUNGING RESOLUTION  
(Concluded)

On resuming his remarks the following day, MR. PORTER said: I am quite sensible of and grateful to the Senate for the indulgence which it extended to me yesterday, and I feel that the best return I can make for its kindness is to condense as much as possible what I have further to say on the question now under consideration.

In the observations I had the honor to offer to the Senate yesterday, I touched on all the arguments offered by the Senator from Missouri which related to our power to expunge, save that which he based on a precedent drawn from a former proceeding of this body. Sir, I am free to confess, when the gentleman read the resolution which, by its language, affirms such a power, I never was more struck with astonishment in my life, and it was under the influence of an irresistible curiosity that I asked the Senator the question I did, and not from the intention of interrupting the train of his remarks. He rebuked me for the interruption justly, but gently, and I acquiesced in it. But, sir, when the honorable Senator further told me to beware resting the matter on so small a point, "or I might be blown up," I felt prepared to join issue with him, and to show him that the point is by no means a small one. On the contrary, the inquiry suggested a principle on which the whole value of the case as a precedent, depends.

If the Senate, in the instance relied on, had determined they possessed the power to expunge from their journal an entry made on it, we should then have had the question submitted, whether any example set by others could authorize us to surrender our clear and conscientious convictions of constitutional obligation. But the case, sir, does not impose any such necessity. What, sir, is its history? It is this: On the last day of a session of Congress, in the year 1806, a petition, or memorial, was presented from certain persons, then under conviction for offences committed against the laws of the United States. This memorial reflected strongly on the conduct of the Chief Magistrate, and its tenor was entered on the minutes. How long after the entry was made we do not know, but not many hours after; and on the same day in which the petition had been received, a motion was made and carried to expunge it from the journal. This motion prevailed. The confusion and hurry which always attend the transaction of business on the last night Congress sits, accounts fully for the inaccuracy of expression used in the resolution; as there was no journal until the entries made during the day were read over and sanctioned by the approbation of the Senate. Until that approbation is given, the acts of the Secretary are no more than minutes of proceedings, over which the body has complete control; just as, in the same manner, the entries of a clerk of a court made during the day are subject to the revision and correction of the judge when read the following morning. Had not the Senate been about to adjourn that night, the measure was entirely gratuitous, as the correction could have been made at the commencement of the next day's sitting, when the minutes prepared by the Secretary were read over. It did not, however, sit, and it is probable this method of getting rid of the obnoxious matter was preferred, as it was a period when party ran high, and the step taken by the petitioners well calculated to excite the passions which belong to such times. Be this, however, as it may, it is obvious that whatever form the majority chose to give their resolution, their power over the matter was undisputed.

I see, sir, some gentlemen dissent to this position. I consider it, however, perfectly sound. It cannot be, it is not true, that the Secretary of a Legislature or the clerk of a court has the right to place any matter he pleases on the minutes of the proceedings, and that neither the judges in the one case, nor the legislative body in the other, have the power to expunge from them what is improperly placed there. It cannot be, it is not true that, if errors are committed by either, they must remain and cannot be corrected; all practice and all reason are opposed to such a doctrine. But this control over the proceedings, before the journal of the clerk or secretary is made up and sanctioned, is totally different from the right claimed here to change or deface the record after it is complete. The court, during its term, may correct any error into which it has fallen. Its minutes are under its control for the same time. But was it ever heard that it could,

at a succeeding one, change, erase from, or add to, the record of its proceedings of a former session? Never, sir. And so, sir, in reason, and on the true principles of the Constitution, is the power of this body limited. Its record, once made, becomes sacred; it is the property of the people, was intended for their protection, and you have no right to deface it.

The Senator from Missouri was well aware of this objection to the precedent cited by him, and he endeavored skilfully to evade it by saying that at all events we could not deny that it was a complete answer to our argument, which assumed the constitutional duty of this House to record all its proceedings. Here, said he, was a proceeding, and a proceeding not recorded. Sir, this is quite plausible, but on a close examination, it offers no real difficulty. The question presented in the instance referred to was precisely that we have been debating for nearly two months or more this session; and that is, the right of this body to reject a petition. We who were in the minority on the abolition memorials, and who contended for their rejection, urged that we had a right to refuse to consider them, and to deny them any place on our journals. Had we then known of this precedent we should have quoted it in support of the position we assumed, for, by erasing the memorial from the minutes, the then Senate declared that they were under no constitutional obligation to receive it, nor to permit any record of it to be preserved. Well, sir, I think the Senate decided correctly in the case to which I have alluded; but the honorable Senator and those who voted with him to receive the petitions will, no doubt, consider the decision of the Senate of 1806 erroneous. If erroneous, it is no authority. If, on the contrary, it was a sound opinion, it establishes what I assert to be the true doctrine, namely, that the Senate have a right to refuse a petition, and are under no obligation to record it. The case cited, therefore, does in no respect conflict with the principles for which we who oppose this resolution contend. All that is decided by it is that the rejection of a petition is not such a proceeding as should be placed on the journals. But, sir, President, did it go the whole length for which the honorable Senator introduced it? I could not permit in a case of this kind that it should control my actions. In constitutional questions, we are not permitted to surrender our conscience to authority. It ought to have no guide but reason. The precedent in itself contains nothing to challenge approbation. It was done in haste. We have no evidence there was any—we know there could not have been much—debate on it the last night of the session. It was passed by a small majority in a very thin Senate. It was a complete party vote, in high party times. To make such a proceeding decisive of a question of this magnitude, would be to place the Constitution of the country at the mercy of every faction which by turns may get possession of a majority in Congress.

I have already said, Mr. President, that I do not consider it made the slightest difference in the question before us, whether the resolution of the Senate, which it is proposed to expunge, was constitutional or otherwise. In my judgment the obligation imposed on us to keep a record of it is precisely the same, be its character what it may. The Constitution makes no distinction; and where it does not distinguish, we cannot. But as I do not agree with the Senator from Missouri that the Senate, in the instance alluded to, either did injustice to the President, or improperly exercised the powers vested in it, I beg leave to make a few observations on the leading proposition, by which this charge of injustice and assumption of power was supposed to be established. We exercised, it is said, on the occasion complained of, judicial not legislative power, and we condemned the President of the United States when he was not accused, and we did so without even hearing his defense.

If all this be true, "the head and front of our offending" is certainly very considerable; but I apprehend it requires no very great ability to show that it has no foundation whatever. We did not, sir, on the occasion alluded to, exercise judicial power, and, therefore, we neither tried nor condemned the President.

Although the legislative, executive, and judicial powers conferred by the Constitution of the United States on the Senate be in theory distinct, yet cases are constantly arising in which the action of the body in its several capacities is imperiously demanded on the very same matter. This is inevitable; for as the powers conferred extend to the person who acts as well as the thing which is acted on, it is impossible, in legislating on the one, or in sitting in judgment on the other, to avoid deciding on matters which are common to both. The exercise of

judicial authority in one aspect presents an exception to this principle. In the investigation which belongs to it, a prominent and controlling inquiry is as to the intention with which the act was committed. An examination of this kind can only be gone into by the Senate when sitting as a court of impeachment; but with this single exception, I maintain that this body, in its legislative and in its executive capacity, can go into an investigation of the legality of acts, and their tendency, just as freely as if no judicial authority was conferred on it. Were it otherwise, its legislative power would be most injuriously abridged, and the executive portion could not be beneficially exercised. Indeed, it is only necessary to have the contrary principle established, and the Chief Magistrate would get a power in his hands which would enable him effectually to put a stop to all legislation on matters in regard to which he thought proper to resort to the exercise of Executive authority. But, if I understand the Constitution rightly, it was not intended the legislative functions of this body should be placed under the control of any other branch of the Government. My reading of it is, that in the use of them it is not more confined in its sphere, nor less free in its action, than the House of Representatives.

See, Mr. President, to what consequences the contrary doctrine would lead. Congress is almost constantly passing laws which require the exercise of Executive authority to carry them into effect; the President construes them according to his judgment, and executes them. The Legislature take the matter into consideration: they think he has assumed a power which the law did not confer, and the exercise of which is injurious to the public interests. A bill is introduced to correct the evil. Is the Senate estopped from acting on it, because, forsooth, it is compelled to look into the construction given by the President of the law, and finds that it differs in opinion from him? Can it extend no remedy for the mischief because he has done wrong?

In an early period of the federal legislation, an act was passed authorizing the President of the United States to remove from the public lands persons who had settled there without permission. It was intended to operate on the class of persons vulgarly but emphatically called *squatters*. In the year 1806 (I think,) Mr. Jefferson enforced this law against a possession which Edward Livingston had of a portion of the batine in front of the city of New Orleans. To this property Mr. L. asserted title under a grant of the French Government to the society of Jesuits. His right was contested by the city of New Orleans, and by proprietors of the lots in front of the river, holding under the same grant. It is not necessary to say, if it were easy to do so, which had the better title; it is enough to state that the property did not belong to the United States, and that the act of removal, however good the motives of the President, and I do not impeach them, was most illegal, and in its operation oppressive in the extreme. An action was brought against Mr. Jefferson for this act, and the cause dismissed for want of jurisdiction in the court, on the ground that the trespass was committed in Louisiana, and the trespasser lived in Virginia. Now I ask, sir, if Mr. Livingston had applied, as well he might, to Congress for compensation for the great pecuniary losses which he sustained by this act of the President, could the Senate not have acted on the bill for affording relief, because it must necessarily have decided that the President had done an act, in the language of the resolution of the Senate, "not conferred by the constitution and laws, but in derogation of both?"

If gentlemen on the other side say it could not have acted on such a bill, because it must have decided on a matter which might thereafter come before it on an impeachment for the act, I leave the correctness of the answer to be decided by the American people without any comment of mine. And if their answer be that it could have constitutionally passed such a law, I inquire what difference there is between deciding that an act of the President was contrary to law, and giving relief for it, and making a declaration to the same effect in the shape of a resolution?

The contest between the present Chief Magistrate and the Bank of the United States is nearer to our own times, and offers an example equally illustrative of the ground I assume. By its charter, the United States engaged to place with it in deposit the public moneys. The President thought he had the power to withdraw them whenever he pleased, and without any cause save his own pleasure. The Senate think differently; and without stopping to inquire which party is right, I ask, could not a bill have been introduced here to compel them to be replaced, because, in our opin-

ion, they had been illegally, and consequently, unconstitutionally removed? I suppose it will hardly be contended it could not. If it could, have we not the power to declare the illegality, by resolution, in the hope that it will induce the Chief Magistrate to reconsider his act and restore the deposits? It requires sharper optics than mine, Mr. President, to see the difference.

We need not stop here, sir. Let us follow this matter in the exercise of that executive power which the Constitution has conferred on us. Individuals while holding high offices are sometimes nominated to the Senate for others. The manner in which they have discharged their duties in the place filled by them is often and of necessity a matter of rigid and severe inquiry. Acts have to be sifted and examined, and a judgment formed on them, to enable us to decide whether it is proper to give our consent to the nomine occupying a high station. The investigation must therefore be often carried to actions which, if committed with a bad motive, might subject the officer to impeachment. Such a case, sir, has occurred, and our authority and bounden duty to go into such inquiries have never, as I know, been questioned, although it manifest the same matter, in relation to the same person, may come before us in a judicial capacity.

Sir, this limitation, which now for the first time in our history is attempted to be placed on the legislative power of the Senate, is a pregnant sign of the prevailing notions of the day. The duties which this body has to perform, in the capacity in which it passed this resolution, are just as important and sacred as those belonging to it in its judicial or executive character. With the opinions entertained by its members they could not, without sacrificing their consciences at the shrines of ease and expediency, have refrained from the declaration they made in relation to the conduct of the Executive in removing the deposits. That measure filled them with a profound, and I will add, a just alarm. In their view of the matter, they saw a great assumption of power on the part of the Chief Magistrate, and they could not be blind to the fact, that the tendency of public opinion was, and I am sorry to say still is, to surrender all authority into the hands of the Executive; to look to him, and to him only, as an index which is to point to what is useful and what is honorable in policy and in legislation. Had they consulted their own convenience, their course was plain; it was to bow to the storm, and trust that, when a less popular man was at the head of the government, the healthy action of all its several departments would be restored. But they took lessons from a purer source, and I trust, a higher wisdom. Experience had taught them that in free governments dangerous precedents are always set by popular men; because it is they and they only who can create a delusion which will permit them to be set. They knew with what fatal effect this example would be cited in after times as a justification of still greater stretches of authority; and they determined, at all hazards, to resist it to the utmost of their ability. For one, sir, I rejoice that they did so; the gratitude of their country awaits them; and posterity will do that justice to their acts and their motives which party spirit now refuses to award them. Far too humble myself to connect history with my name, I fondly indulge the hope that the position I occupied at that moment will attach me in some degree to it, as one of those who stood manfully in the breach in the unequal battle which was fought for the Constitution. I desire no higher praise, and would ask no prouder epithet to be engraven on my tomb."

In a late period of the federal legislation, an act was passed authorizing the President to remove from the public lands persons who had settled there without permission. It was intended to operate on the class of persons vulgarly but emphatically called *squatters*. In the year 1806 (I think,) Mr. Jefferson enforced this law against a possession which Edward Livingston had of a portion of the batine in front of the city of New Orleans. To this property Mr. L. asserted title under a grant of the French Government to the society of Jesuits. His right was contested by the city of New Orleans, and by proprietors of the lots in front of the river, holding under the same grant. It is not necessary to say, if it were easy to do so, which had the better title; it is enough to state that the property did not belong to the United States, and that the act of removal, however good the motives of the President, and I do not impeach them, was most illegal, and in its operation oppressive in the extreme. An action was brought against Mr. Jefferson for this act, and the cause dismissed for want of jurisdiction in the court, on the ground that the trespass was committed in Louisiana, and the trespasser lived in Virginia. Now I ask, sir, if Mr. Livingston had applied, as well he might, to Congress for compensation for the great pecuniary losses which he sustained by this act of the President, could the Senate not have acted on the bill for affording relief, because it must necessarily have decided that the President had done an act, in the language of the resolution of the Senate, "not conferred by the constitution and laws, but in derogation of both?"

That which regarded Mr. Barry is as follows:

"Resolved. That the President, in the late executive proceedings in relation to the revenue, has assumed upon himself authority and power not conferred by the Constitution and laws, but in derogation of both."

That which regarded Mr. Barry is as follows:

"Resolved. That it is proved and admitted that large sums of money have been borrowed at different banks by the Postmaster General in order to make up the deficiency in the means of carrying on the business of the Post Office Department, without authority given by any law of Congress; and that, as Congress alone possesses the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States, all such contracts for loans by the Postmaster are illegal and void."

Now, sir, I cannot see any of the slightest difference between these cases, and I defy the most subtle intellect to show how they can be distinguished from each other. And, sir, on examining the vote given on that case, we do not find it was a party vote. Far from it; it was the unanimous voice of the Senate, and the vote of the Senator from Missouri stands recorded among the number. Well, sir, may I not ask if it was a violation of the Constitution of the United States to vote that Gen. Jackson had exercised a power not conferred on him by law, was it not an equal violation of it to vote that Mr. Barry had acted contrary to law? Do the names make any difference? Or is it that the action which is constitutional in regard to a Postmaster General becomes a heinous offence when committed against one clothed with the power and upheld by the popularity of the President of the United States? I trust not. But still it is left to gentlemen who are now preparing to expunge this resolution because it prejudices Gen. Jackson, to explain why they voted for that against Mr. Barry, which equally prejudiced him. They must also explain why they leave the latter resolution untouched on the journals, and expunge the former. Is it because they voted for that against the Postmaster that it is sacred? or has slow repentence not yet reached them? Sir, it has been said that the most ignorant man may ask a question which the wisest cannot answer; and I apprehend they will find themselves pretty much in that condition in relation to these interrogatories.

The Senator from Missouri, however, who takes time by the forelock, has anticipated this objection, and has given his explanation. He says the vote was forced on him, and, finding himself compelled to act in this unconstitutional way, he conceived that he was in no respect sanctioning the course which the Senate pursued; that a negative vote would have admitted the jurisdiction just as much as an affirmative one. Without in the slightest respect impugning the sincerity of this declaration, and giving it full effect,

I must still remark, that though it may sustain the consistency of the Senator, it still leaves the precedent in all its original force, as the construction of laws, or the deductions to be made from the acts of legislative bodies, can be in no respect affected by the declarations of individual members of their views or motives in concurring in them. And I must also say, that I should think it is a very good reason to vote against a resolution or law, that I believed it to be unconstitutional. But be this as it may, it only explains the vote of the Senator, and we have the sanction of all the rest of his friends for the constitutionality of our proceeding. And at all events it is no justification for permitting the resolution in regard to Mr. Barry to remain, and expunging that relating to the President. If either is to be effaced from our journal, I hope both will. If justice requires this act, let it be extended to the memory of him who has passed hence to another and better world, as well as to him who remains among us. Let the bounty of the honorable Senator extend to all similarly situated. I trust he will recollect.

"That the selfsame sun which shines upon a Court

Hides not his visage from the cottage."

I think, Mr. President, I have shown that the Constitution of the country will be violated if we adopt the resolution of the honorable Senator, and I hope I have satisfactorily answered the principal reasons presented by him in support of it.

The remaining portion of the honorable Senator's speech was devoted to two subjects: a panegyric on Gen. Jackson, and a vituperation of the late Bank of the United States. The relevancy of either or both these matters to the question now before us, he will excuse me for saying is not exactly seen by me, and I might well pass them by; but a few observations before I close, on some of the topics he advanced, will, I trust, be pardoned.

And first, sir, as to the praises which the Senator has dealt out with such an overflowing hand to the President, I have to say that I find no fault with them. They proceed, no doubt, from the strong partiality which the gentleman from Missouri feels for their object, and his friendship, and the modes he takes to manifest it are matters entirely personal to himself. It would be the less excusable in me to complain of this failing, as it is one which I share largely in myself. In spite of every thing I can do, sir, I find the utmost difficulty in seeing faults in those to whom I am attached. My self-love gets interested in sustaining them in my own opinion, and it is dexterous in palliating their weaknesses and magnifying their virtues. With the perfect consciousness of this tendency of my own nature, I can make great allowance for what I consider the extravagant praise which the Senator has bestowed on the present Chief Magistrate. But, after making all concessions of this kind, I cannot help thinking the gentleman from Missouri has pushed the matter a little too far; that he has even stretched beyond its due extent the old maxim,

"Lay it on thick, and some will stick."

It is, perhaps, rash in me, sir, to say so. Sir, the honorable Senator is skilled in matters of this kind, but I just submit to him whether he did not set all the laws of probability (at least) at defiance, when he said that "Gen. Jackson had rendered more benefit to mankind than all the politicians that ever existed."

[Mr. BENTON here said he had been misunderstood; that he said "all the *hack* politicians who had ever lived."]

Mr. PORTER continued. If, sir, the Senator so limited his remark, I do not gainsay it. On the contrary, it has my entire assent. There is no class of men for whom I have a more thorough contempt—no, sir, not my contempt, they are not worthy of it—there are no men for whom I have a more intense pity, than I have for those who come under the denomination of *hack* politicians. They are a miserable race generally, lost to all honor, truth, and patriotism, who sell themselves for office, and, when they obtain it, use place and station to plunder more successfully the people they have deceived. With such men, sir, I would not compare Gen. Jackson for a moment; but, sir, I think, on reflection, the Senator from Missouri will see that I was not mistaken, and that, in the warmth of his eulogium, he did carry his comparison to the extent I have stated. Such are my notes of his speech. [Here Mr. BENTON said the Senator from Louisiana might so understand his remarks.] Well, sir, with that permission, I proceed to comment on the compliment paid to the President; and, looking back, I find that Solon was a politician, Aristides was a politician, Aristides was a politician, Pericles was a politician, Cicero was a politician, John Hampden (a name never to be mentioned in a temple of freedom without reverence and gratitude) was a politician; Lord Chatham was a politician; John Hancock, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson were politicians. And sir, with these names comes a crowd of recollections which force me to think that Solon, and Aristides, and Pericles, and Cicero, and John Hampden, and Lord Chatham, and Hancock, and Jefferson, and Franklin, taken altogether, have rendered just as much service to mankind as Gen. Jackson, and a little more.

Sir, in making these remarks, I am not to be understood as wishing to detract from the reputation of the President,

He has many qualities I respect, and he has rendered important services to his country. No one, sir, admires more than I do his indomitable will, strong native sagacity, and that almost sublime energy with which he pursues and generally attains his purpose. I appreciate, too, sir, at its just value, the unshaken attachment he displays to his friends, though the virtue be, as I admit it is, more fitted for the ornament of private than of public life. But close alongside of these strong points of character lie defects which I fear will be painfully felt, and long seen in their untoward influence on public prosperity. But this is an ungrateful theme, which I have no desire to pursue, and I return to the remaining portion of the subject.

I am sure the Senate will pardon me for not following the argument I am relying on, through the minute examination given by it to the affairs of the United States Bank. I see no use in warning with the dead. The party in power have destroyed the bank on their responsibility, and I leave to them the pleasure and advantages of a *post mortem* examination. I shall not assist at it. If I had the wish to do so, I have not the knowledge to enable me to meet the Senator on so intricate and confused a field. He has with great industry made himself master of a variety of facts of which I have no knowledge, still less of those by which his statements might be explained, or the incorrectness of the views he has taken exhibited. Indeed, such is the absorbing attention which the Senator from Missouri has given to this same great monster, the Bank of the United States, that I apprehend there is no man in the Republic, except the President of the Bank, who is able to give answers to all the objections and charges, while the fertile imagination of the honorable member can at any moment conjure up. I would, therefore, suggest to him that great advantages would accrue to the Republic if he would, in some way or other, have a regular discussion with the *parent of mischief*, Old Nick himself, in regard to the former transactions of the bank.

They might play the game by letter, as that of chess is sometimes done, or, what would, perhaps, be better, they could meet at some half-way place, and each limiting himself to half an hour at a time (I should consider this clause in the agreement very important), they might at the end of five or six months end the matter quite as satisfactorily as the theological contests of a similar character we sometimes hear of generally terminating, that is, the auditors would come away with their heads confused, their passions heated, and their original prepossessions confirmed.

On this matter I can only state the impression produced on my mind by all I have seen and heard on this question, and the conviction I express has, at all events, this recommendation; that it comes from one who has never had any connexion with the bank in any way whatever, and whose judgment is not clouded by the recollection either of favors received, or favors refused. I say, then, sir, in all sincerity, that nothing has yet come under my consideration to induce me to think that the Bank of the United States was not wisely and honestly conducted, and I am convinced that its operations were most useful and salutary to the nation. It gave us a sound currency, and it regulated exchanges with a success until then unknown, and which, if we have not reached that point already, we must soon cease to enjoy. No institution with its power, which ever existed, so studiously abstained from all interference with either national or state politics, up to the time when it pleased those opposed to it to raise the war-cry of party, and to denounce it to the public, instead of calling it before a court of justice, where, according to the terms of its charter, all violations of it were to be tried. I shall not attempt to characterize what it did afterwards; that must be judged by others; but I fear we are still too near the heated scenes which this contest has given rise to, to judge of it correctly. Dragged from its legal and constitutional judges, and arraigned before the American people, it had no choice as to the place or mode of defence. It had no alternative but to submit in silence to all the imputations heaped on it, or to meet them by denial and proof. That it may have sometimes overstepped the limits of defence by assaulting its opponents, may be true; and that its language may not have been always as guarded as policy would have dictated, is perhaps equally true, nor is it important. The fault lies with those by whom the irregular and unconstitutional assault was first made, and much is to be pardoned to the feelings such a proceeding produced. It is very easy for the physician, who stands by the side of the victim who is racked, to tell him that his complaints must be courteous, and his cries gentle; but this species of forbearance, like many other virtues, it is much less difficult to preach about than practice.

Now have I ever seen any proof that it abused its power at the time when, from the widespread alarm which filled the community on the removal of the deposits, a total want of confidence in pecuniary matters seized on the public mind; and this has again and again been shown. The contraction of its discounts was not greater than the removal of the deposits warranted; and the necessity

of transmitting its funds from distant points to those nearer home, where it was menaced with a pressure, without the imputation of unworthy motives, accounts for the facts which the Senator referred to.

And, sir, there is just as great a mistake in regard to the motives attributed to the members on this floor who were opposed to the measures taken by the President in relation to the Bank. I am really, sir, almost tempted to get out of humor with the Senator from Missouri at the small compliment he pays to our common sense, when he asserts that the course pursued by us was prompted by the hope of influencing elections, and promoting party ends. I beg the Senator to understand that deferring to him, as I am sure all on this side of the House readily would, to his superior skill in electioneering, and to a knowledge of all topics by which the passions and prejudices of the multitude can be inflamed, we were not quite so ignorant of these things as to ever flatter ourselves the Bank could be made popular with the people. Reason and experience, sir, both taught us another lesson.

We knew perfectly well, sir, that an institution of this kind never could be acceptable to the mass. Banks always must be disliked by them, because the benefits which they confer on society are indirect, and the philosophy of their utility out of common reach, while the advantages which they confer on the owners of them are great and palpable, and obvious, because they are exclusive.

We knew all this, sir, and, if we had not known it, experience had taught us the lesson. We saw the old Bank of the United States, which was wisely conducted, which had given us a sound currency, and whose whole operations had been beneficial to society—we saw it, sir, prostrated before public calomn and public prejudice, and that, too, at the moment we were about entering on war with one of the most powerful nations on earth, when its assistance was most important to the fiscal operations of the Government. We knew, sir, that all the causes which produced this result were in active operation again; and we fore-saw just as well as our opponents did, that the same conclusion was extremely probable.

There was no difference in our preception of this matter, though there was a wide difference in our view of the consequences. We saw distress and ruin to society in the measure, and we resisted it without any regard to its effect on our popularity. They either did not see them, or, if they did see, they disregarded them. I wish, sir, we had been false prophets. I would with cheerfulness give up the praise of wisdom and foresight, to avert the swarm of evils which this measure of the Administration is about to bring on the country, or rather which it has already brought on the country.

We clearly foresaw, sir, what would take place, and we as distinctly warned gentlemen on the other side of the inevitable derangement of the currency which must follow the measures they were pursuing. We entreated them to look back on the events which ensued on the refusal, in 1811, to charter the old bank—to reflect on the destruction of credit and prostration of morals which flowed from the multiplication of State banks soon after that period—to remember how at last one-third of the property of the country had changed hands in the space of a few years—and to think how many families had been reduced from affluence to poverty by similar measures. We beseeched them to look at those things, but we beseeched in vain. The then Secretary of the Treasury told us State banks could furnish as good or better currency than the United States Bank. The President endorsed the statement. The Senator from Missouri talked of his metallic currency, and the golden age which was approaching; and under these errors and misconceptions, the work of mischief was done.

But now, sir, when all these delusions have passed, or are rapidly passing away, is it not meet and proper that we should, from the eminence on which we stand, look at the full extent of the evil which is approaching us? We may draw from the past and present some salutary lessons for the future.

I shall not, sir, fatigue the Senate by going back to that period of our history at the close of the Revolutionary War, when there was such a rapid depreciation of the value of the currency, though it furnishes strong examples to illustrate the views I entertain on this matter. I content myself with recalling the attention of the Senate to the circumstances which preceded, accompanied, and followed the destruction of the first National Bank, and I am greatly mistaken if the parallel between the condition of the country now with what it was then, will not be found complete.

Previous to the expiration of the charter of the first Bank of the United States, the currency of the country was in a very sound state, and it continued so up to that period, and for a short time after. The States, however, soon began to charter institutions of their own, and between 1811 and 1813 a considerable addition was made to the circulation. In 1816 it became excessive. During all this period the country bore the external marks of prosperity; trade flourished, land, slaves, houses and lots, and all other species of property, rose in value. Real estate,

which could have been brought in 1810 for \$10 an acre, in 1816 sold for \$80 and \$100. I remember the time well, sir; the universal prosperity of the country was the theme of every man's tongue, and speculation ran riot in its magnificence. But, sir, these things are subject to laws as certain as anything else in this world. There is a point beyond which you cannot carry them. The bubble, when inflated too much, bursts. In 1817 and 1818 the reduction in the circulation commenced. It was at first slow and gradual, and its effects scarcely perceptible. Each day, however, rendered them more apparent, when, in 1819, the circulation being by 50 per cent less than that of 1815, there ensued a pecuniary distress which has never been exceeded in any country. Every article of commerce, land, slaves, houses, fell as far below their real value as they had before risen beyond it. The most enormous sacrifices were made at public and private sales; and every one was astonished, for they could not account for such a change in the general prosperity.

Sir, they are all accounted for by these naked facts; in 1813 the circulation of the country was *seventy millions of dollars*, in 1815 *one hundred and ten millions*, in 1819 *forty five millions*. Sir, it was not property that had risen in 1815, it was money that had depreciated; and it was the *greater value* of it, produced by its scarcity in 1819, that made that property fall in price.

I have taken these facts, sir, from the report of the then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Crawford, and they may be relied on. There can be no mistake in the deduction I make from them.

It would seem, sir, as if all experience was lost on us. We again see the same extraordinary rise in the price of every thing which is an object of sale. Every one, as heretofore, is expatiating on the universal prosperity, and there are no bounds to the imaginations in which men indulge in these matters. But, sir, our situation is just the same as it was in the other time I have been speaking of.

In 1830, our circulation was *sixty-one millions of dollars*. In January, 1835, or rather in June, 1834, it was "one hundred and three millions of dollars." In 1836, it cannot be less than "one hundred and twenty millions." An increase of sixty millions of dollars in six years! I give the facts from the official returns made by the Secretary of the Treasury. They come, sir, as it is true, no lower down than 1835. But if we take the average increase for two or three years before that time, and reflect on the enormous rise of property since (a sure indication of an unhealthy circulation), we must be satisfied that there has been more than seventeen millions added to the circulation within the last sixteen months, and that one hundred and twenty millions is now rather than above the real estimate.

You see, sir, therefore, at a glance, the causes of the present state of things; and who cannot also, sir, see at a glance how it is to end? If the evil could be checked now, and the reduction be slow and gradual, we might escape the consequences which time has inevitably in store for us under any other policy. But, sir, far from expecting this, I look to an increase of the disease. It appears to me inevitable. A universal madness has taken possession of the public mind. Within the last four months I have heard of augmentations of banking capital proposed or passed, to the amount of fifty millions of dollars, and more I am told are projecting; so that we may expect to see this system continuing until it breaks and falls from its own weight and magnitude. In the present state of things, the States are all interested to increase the circulation of their own banks, and prevent that of their neighbors. Indeed, we already see symptoms of a war of legislation (the result of jealousy), by which they are attempting to restrain the notes of banks in other States from passing within their limits.

This deplorable state of things must yet get worse; and well might the Senator from Missouri depict it in the colors he did a few days ago. He could not overcharge this picture—a picture, sir, rendered more painful to contemplate, by the recollection of our condition before the war was waged on the Bank of the United States. For sixteen years it regulated the currency of the country, with a wisdom and success of which there is no parallel. We threw it away, and we see what we have got in its place. Sir, all the projects of regulating and checking the excess of bank emissions by law, refusing to receive at your Treasury their notes of a less sum than \$20, will have no more effect than would have a bucket full of earth thrown into the Mississippi to stop its current. And as to pushing gold and silver into circulation when you have five hundred and fifty banks interested in gathering it all up, and supplying its place with their notes, that is equally impracticable; a cheap and a dear currency never can exist together; the former always destroys the latter. Having no power by the Constitution to interfere directly with the State legislation in this matter, I see that the country is destined to go through the same scenes of agitation and suffering which it did previous to the operation of the late Bank of the United States. After the evils have come to a height when they can no longer be endured, we shall have another National Bank, and not un-

til then. But I submit if it would not have been as well to have prevented this state of things two years ago! I inquire, what good has been, or can be attained, by putting the People through this fearful trial? Five or six years hence will be the time to get an answer to these questions.

Sir, it affords me no consolation for all the calamities which I see approaching, that we are told the People of the United States have approved of all the acts of the President in relation to the Bank. If they had, I could not surrender my impressions; but I have seen no evidence of the fact. It is inferred from his re-election, and from a majority of his friends being found in Congress. But, sir, I protest against any such a fallacy being received as proof of their approval. I believe, on the contrary, that the President was re-elected, and is now sustained, in *spite* of the removal of the deposits, not in *consequence* of that act. When I came here two years ago, I conversed in private with none of his friends who did not regret the step, though they were unwilling to abandon him for what they conceived to be an honest error. These friends still sustain him, because, with his defects and mistakes, they prefer him to those who might take his place. This, sir, is the true ground, not that taken in argument. By such reasoning as has been offered on this floor, every President who is re-elected has done no wrong, nor fallen into any error; he is infallible. It is a pure sophism, sir, to assert that the re-election of any man argues an approval of each of his acts. It is only evidence that, taking them all good and bad together, the People accept him.

Sir, I have much more to say, but the state of my health forbids me to go farther; and I conclude by again returning my thanks to the Senate for the attention with which they have honored me.

In the House of Representatives, on the sixth instant, Mr. Wise of Virginia, asked the consent of the house to introduce the following preamble and resolution, but was refused.

Whereas, since the custody of the public money has been under the entire control of the Treasury Department, the Secretary of the Treasury, by himself or his agents, has selected certain local state banks as places of deposit, without regulation by law; and whereas there is great doubt about the agency by which the said deposit banks are selected and regulated; and whereas said agency is alleged to be improper and corrupt, effected by some person or persons, not officers of the Government, or appointed or responsible as such, or known in any manner to the laws, and who are secretly paid large stipends or amounts of compensation for procuring the custody and the use of the public deposits; and whereas the said banks, for which the public deposits are thus procured, are in possession of interest or other charge whatsoever for the use of the same, and the said person or persons, their agent or agents, are alleged to be political partisans, wielding the public deposits for electioneering purposes, dangerous to the purity of the Government and to the liberties of the People; therefore,

*Resolved*, That a select committee be appointed, with power to send for persons and papers, to inquire into the mode or agency of selecting the banks of deposit for the public money; the contracts with the treasury department by which they are regulated; the manner in which and the persons by whom such contracts are made; into all correspondence whatsoever touching contracts for the public deposits; into all connexion or relation, official or unofficial, which exists or has existed between any person or persons and the Treasury Department, or between them and the deposit banks, or any other individuals or banks, touching the custody and the control and deposit of the public money, and into the amount and mode of compensation of all persons whosoever in any manner whatever connected with the Treasury Department or the deposit banks, having any agency whatever in negotiating between said Department and said banks, or any banks or individuals, touching the public deposits; and that said committee have leave to report by bill or otherwise.

We learn from the Columbus Telescope, that the act incorporating the Louisville, Cincinnati, and Charleston Railroad, having become a law in South and North Carolina, Tennessee, and Kentucky, the commissioners appointed by the former, to cause the necessary surveys to be made, met in Columbia on the 25th ult. The commissioners consist of Gen. Hayne, Col. Blanding, Gen. Thomas F. Jones, Hon. P. Noble, Dr. Thomas Smith, and Charles Edmonston, esq., who have made all the preliminary arrangements for entering immediately on the explorations and surveys. Col. Gadsden was appointed chief engineer, who will have the assistance of the following officers, (ordered on this duty by the Secretary of War,) to wit: Capt. Williams, Lieut. Drayton, Lieut. White, of the U. S. Army, and Mr. Featherstonhaugh, a civil engineer in the service of the Government. The result of the explorations to be made will be laid before the Convention to be assembled on the subject at Knoxville, on the 4th of July next.

*Nat. Intelligencer.*

## HILLSBOROUGH.

Friday, April 13.

The editor of the *Milton Spectator*, in his paper of the 5th instant, has given what he calls a definition of the meaning which he attaches to the word "Democracy." It is very luminous and very short, and perhaps some of our readers will be able to comprehend it. Here it is:

"The Editor of the *Recorder* seems quite anxious that we should explain what we mean by the term 'Democracy,' or 'Republicanism.' To be brief, we will reply to him in a way which he cannot misinterpret; we therefore plainly tell him that it is the very reverse of himself and his principles. We will further tell him that 'republicanism' is a plain, old fashioned thing, and that its principal motto is 'to let well enough alone.' Its disciples are therefore well pleased with the principles of the present Administration; they have judged of the tree by its fruits, and rejoice that their beloved country is prosperous and happy. They are not, therefore, willing to sacrifice all, merely to gratify a few disappointed politicians, who would willingly see their country plunged in all the horrors of war, pestilence and famine, if thereby they could gratify their own personal ambition."

### A picture for the People—one of the Pets!

No person has had a better opportunity than the editor of the *Spectator*, to understand our principles; it is therefore to be presumed that he understands himself when he says his principles are directly the reverse of ours. Whether we can or cannot misinterpret him, we certainly have no desire to do so; and if in comparing our principles with what he says are his, we should conjure up an image which he is not inclined to own, he can say so. We are not without hope that the editor of the *Spectator* will profit by the view which we shall give him. If he really entertains opinions opposite to ours, he will have an opportunity to examine their correctness; if, as appears more likely to be the case, he has never examined into the complexion of his own principles, or even whether he has any, he will hereafter avoid the danger of making wholesale declarations without first understanding himself.

In the brief exposition which follows, we have confined ourselves to declarations which we have made in recent editorial articles; the editor of the *Spectator* can not, therefore, have forgotten them. But though recently avowed, they are principles not recently adopted; they have been maintained by the tenor and profession of our whole life. We thus begin:

We prefer our own institutions before all other systems of government; and wish them to continue, in *practice* as well as in name, purely Republican. Is the editor of the *Spectator* willing to take the opposite? Does he wish, though retaining the name of a republic, to see more that kingly powers accumulating in the hands of the Executive?

We desire to preserve inviolate both the letter and spirit of our admirable Constitution, the most perfect instrument of the kind which has ever been formed; as we believe it to be the only means by which can be secured the permanence of the republic, and the freedom of the people. Does the editor of the *Spectator* wish to break down the Constitution, and thus introduce a train of evils which will inevitably follow?

We are anxious to preserve, at all hazards, the integrity of the Union. Is the editor of the *Spectator* a Nullifier, ready to sacrifice the last hope of liberty for a pecuniary consideration of doubtful result? or to maintain *state rights* at the expense of *national anarchy*?

We are desirous of securing the utmost freedom in elections. Does the editor of the *Spectator* wish to cast around them the shackles of party?

In selecting officers, we would place among the most prominent of our inquiries—"Is he honest?—is he capable?—is he faithful to the Constitution? Does the editor of the *Spectator* think it enough to inquire—"Is he true to the party?"

In the inferences which are here drawn, does the editor of the *Spectator* consider himself as rightly interpreted? or does he begin to perceive that he did not know himself?

The perception which the editor of the *Spectator* has of the word "Democracy," will perhaps be well illustrated by an anecdote which has just been related to us. Two gentlemen with whom we are well acquainted, one a Van Buren and the other a White man, were lately conversing together on political subjects. The Van Buren man observed, that very few persons understood the term "Democracy;" if better understood, he thought it would be more universally adopted. "Pray, sir," said the White man, "will you be so good as to explain what you understand to be implied by the term *Democracy*?" "Why," replied the Van Buren man, "a Democrat is a true Republican."

"Well, my dear sir, what do you understand by a true Republican?" "Why, a Republican is—is—a real Democrat!" This hasty explanation was quite satisfactory to the White man, and he made his bow.

The editor of the *Spectator* has stirred up several matters upon which we have a desire to make a few observations; but

not having room now, we shall postpone them to another opportunity.

Many of our readers will recollect that during the Congressional canvass in this district in 1833, the U. S. Bank made a prominent item in the discussions of the candidates; and among the devices used to excite the prejudices of the people against that institution, a long list was exhibited of English noblemen and ladies who were holders of stock. It was then stated, though the fact was but little attended to, that a large portion of the stock of the Manhattan Bank of New York, one of the *deposito Banks*, was held by an English nobleman; and if the argument was good against the Bank of the United States, it ought to be good also against other institutions. It will perhaps also be recollected, that the President of the United States, in his veto of the Bank bill, made it one of his objections that a large amount of stock was held by foreigners, and that consequently large sums of money were yearly drawn from the country as dividends upon their stock. It will be seen by the following article from the *New York Evening Star*, that the Marquis of Carmarthen, for his six hundred thousand dollars of stock in the Manhattan Bank, receives not only the regular interest arising upon his own capital, but over *seventy thousand dollars* for interest upon the money of the people of the United States, deposited in his bank.

### A picture for the People—one of the Pets!

"The capital of the Manhattan Bank is two million and fifty thousand dollars; of this over *six hundred thousand dollars* belongs to the family of an English nobleman. We have not the returns before us, and if we are in error the Cashier, who holds the power of attorney, can correct us. This Bank held on deposit on the first of February last, *three millions sixty seven thousand dollars* of the people's money, which at legal interest produces *two hundred and fourteen thousand six hundred and ninety dollars annually*; of which the Marquis of Carmarthen will receive over *seventy thousand dollars*. Observe, this is besides the interest which arises out of his own capital invested in the Bank. This is the *gratuity* or *bonus* which the administration gives him to relieve themselves from the necessity of distributing it among the states for the Education of the children, and the improvement of the condition of the poor."

Now we call upon every man, to what party he may be attached, to any, even the system, of which this is but an example, be right!

The *Greensborough Patriot* has passed into the hands of Messrs. Alfred E. Hanner and C. N. B. Evans. Two numbers of the new series have been received, and their appearance is calculated to make a favorable impression as to the ability with which the publication will be conducted. On national politics, they profess a determination temporally, though decidedly, to support the claims of Judge White for the Presidency.

A correspondent in *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser*, in a short article on the "expunging process," appears to take a proper view of the subject. He thus inquires—"Can you, or can any of your readers, tell me what is the object of all this fuss in the Senate, about 'expunging,' and where it will end? If black lines are to be drawn around or across any words, will they, by such a process, be thereby erased or obliterated from the journal? I should suppose they will not. Well then, will they be erased from the memory? I imagine not. On the contrary, will not the fact contained in the obnoxious resolutions, be more indelibly impressed on the minds of thousands, by keeping the subject before the public? Most assuredly they will. Benton may rail about this affair as loud as long as he pleases, he will never be able to 'rail the seal from the bond.' The resolutions are on the journal of the Senate, and there they will remain."

The body of George W. Martin, of Rockingham, who was killed by the explosion of the Steam Boat, Ben Franklin, at Mobile, was found near the place where the disaster occurred on the 24th ult. (eleven days after the accident.) Judge Martin, an acquaintance of his father, had had the river searched with drags for eight or ten days, but without success, and had despaired of finding the body, when it made its appearance, and was brought ashore by a boatman. It was fortunate that Gen. Davidson, formerly of Iredell, was present, and immediately gave notice to Judge Martin of the fact. Twelve thousand dollars in U. S. notes was found upon the body in a belt, which was counted in the presence of Gen. Davidson, Dr. Carter and Mr. Wilson of Mecklenburg, N. C., and secured with some other valuables, for his next of kin, who we believe is, his father, Alex. S. Martin: he was unmarried.

### Salisbury Watchman.

The Steam Boat Randolph took fire near Nashville, Tenn. on the 18th ult. and was totally destroyed, with its cargo, valued at \$300,000. Two negro men were drowned, and one killed.

*Suicide.*—Samuel Osborne, a respectable young man in the south part of this county, committed suicide on the 20th

ult. by hanging himself. The bosom of a quiet and harmless family of brothers and sisters has been laden with a lasting sorrow. There is no assignable cause for the act, unless it was an anticipation of difficulties in his pecuniary affairs.

### Greensborough Pal.

#### Washington, April 6.

Mr. Leigh, of Virginia, addressed the Senate on Monday and yesterday, in opposition to the *Expunging Resolution*. The Senate was crowded on both days with an auditory whose attention was riveted during the whole time, and the speech is the theme of general admiration. We presume Mr. Leigh never exerted his eminent abilities more happily or more successfully, and the Senate, we are confident, has rarely listened to a more masterly, eloquent, and triumphant train of reasoning. He tore down and scattered to the winds the whole tissue of arguments and alleged precedents by which it is vainly attempted to sustain the proposition for mutilating the journal of the Senate; and not only established, clearly and indisputably, the inviolability of that record, but vindicated beyond all cavil the perfect competency of the Senate to pass the resolution touching the conduct of the Executive, which it is now proposed to expunge from the journal.

### Nat. Intell.

#### Increase of the Army.

General Macomb has submitted to the Senate, in obedience to a resolution of that body, a plan for the increase of the army to ten thousand men, without adding to the number of officers. The opinion seems to be unanimous among men of all parties, that our present force is entirely inadequate to the public defence. Had it been in the power of the general government to send a full and efficient force to Florida on the first breaking out of hostilities, that war would ere this time have been over, and a heavy loss of lives and property would have been averted. Our immense frontier is but half protected. General Macomb proposes that there shall be eight regiments of artillery, each comprising five companies of 100 men; nine regiments of infantry, each comprising eight companies of 72 men; and one regiment of dragoons comprising 715. The aggregate, including the non-commissioned staff, will be 9955 men.

### Pennsylvanian.

It is said that Mr. Wilkins, our Minister at St. Petersburg, is about to return home, his fortune and salary being too small to allow him to support the style and state of his brother ambassadors. Let him take refuge behind his democracy, and lodge, as Mr. Adams did at London, over a barber's shop.

### Balt. Chronicle.

We learn that Mr. Jaudon, Cashier of the U. S. Bank, has gone to England for the purpose of carrying into effect an arrangement already made, by which the Bank has disposed of the notes which it took of the various institutions and individuals who purchased the Branches. By this operation the Bank will realize over \$20,000,000 immediately, besides making a liberal profit on the difference between the rates of interest received and paid.

### N. York Jour. of Com.

A bill has passed both houses of the New York legislature, authorizing a company to construct a *tunnel* under the Hudson River at Albany.

An attempt is about to be made in this country to manufacture *Sugar* from *beets*. Such manufacture is carried on to a great extent in France.

*Spots on the Sun.*—A gentleman in New York has discovered three spots on the N. W. limb of the sun's disc, which he says extend over 75,000 miles of its surface.

*Retributive Justice.*—The legislatures of Maryland and Pennsylvania have recently passed laws making retribution to individuals whose property has been destroyed by mobs in Baltimore and Philadelphia. This legislation will go far to suppress the lawless spirit which has done so much evil in our country during the last three or four years. It is founded on the soundest principle of policy and just government—the principle that protection and allegiance are reciprocal duties—that the government is bound to protect the property of the citizen from outrage and violence, in return for the support and obedience which the citizen gives to the government.

*A Handsome Fee.*—It is said that the sum of twenty five thousand dollars has been charged by Mr. Edward Livingston, for the management of the great case between the U. S. and the city of New Orleans, by which the latter gained one million of dollars.

The salary allowed to the Cashier of the "Citizens' Bank" at New Orleans, (Mr. J. B. Perrault) is 13,000 dollars, which, with his house, &c. will be equal to \$15,000 per annum. So much for the compensation of a cash-keeper. In most of the states, a judge, who keeps the public peace, and protects or sequesters life, liberty, and property, by his adjudications under the laws, receives hardly the tenth part of this salary, out of which moreover, he has to pay his travelling

expenses. Louisiana, however, it ought to be observed, is more liberal to her judges, though she does not allow them quite so princely a salary as "the Citizens" allow to their cashier. She gives to her chief judge 8,000 dollars a year, and to her Governor 7,500 dollars.

### Nat. Intelligencer.

*Anson County.*—A letter to the Editor, from a gentleman in Anson, gives the gratifying assurance, that "There is great unanimity in old 'democratic' Anson;" and the Van Buren men are so scarce that it would puzzle any of their party to call a meeting and have friends sufficient to fill the Chair, and other important appointments. Dudley appears to take well." *Fayetteville Obs.*

The *Louisiana Advertiser*, the oldest and one of the most respectable papers in New Orleans, has come out for Hugh L. White as a candidate for the next Presidency.

*Mississippi.*—A correspondent in Mississippi writes us that the current of public opinion is turning rapidly in favor of Judge White, and that he will obtain the vote of that state by a triumphant majority, the intrigue and corruption of the Spoils Party to the contrary notwithstanding.

### Jonesborough Rep.

In Missouri, Maj. Benjamin O. Fallon, who headed the Jackson electoral ticket in 1828, and succeeded by an immense majority, has permitted his name to be placed on the White ticket of 1836, and so universally popular is he, that the result in that state, *cannot now be doubted*.

### Com. Adv.

Extract of letter from Capt. Barr of the Louisiana volunteers, to the editor of the *N. Orleans Bulletin*, dated Fort Brooke, Tampa Bay, Feb. 17th:

"On the morning of our arrival, an Indian prisoner was killed in an attempt to escape; he was taken in a manner which might grace even the romantic days of chivalry. A fine noble looking Indian, asked in marriage the daughter of Black Diri, a friendly chieftain; the old man declared that none but a warrior need pretend to his daughter, and desired young Yellow Hair, if he wished to prove himself one, to go into the woods and make prisoners of three hostile Seminoles. Yellow Hair accordingly dashed alone into the forest and actually brought in three of the enemy; whether he surrounded them (as the Irishman did), or not, I do not pretend to say, but two of the prisoners are now chained in the Fort, and the other was killed in the manner I mentioned. Yellow Hair of course married his black haired damsel, and set out on the 13th, at the head of a party of his countrymen, to act as a scout from the main army, who have marched in quest of the enemy."

*IMPORTANT FROM TEXAS.*  
Fall of San Antonio and Massacre of the Texian Troops!

The last *New Orleans Bulletin* contains a letter from Gen. Houston, giving the particulars of the above horrid tragedy.

The fort was attacked on the 6th of March, about midnight, by Santa Anna in person with 2000 men. They were repulsed with the loss of 500 to 800 men. In the morning the Texians, 150 in number, were called on to surrender unconditionally, which they refused; but proposed to surrender as *negotiations* of war, which was agreed to. They had marched out of the fort, and were soon joined by their arms, than a general assault was made upon them by the whole Texian force! They attempted to escape, but only three succeeded, one of whom was Col. Johnson.

One woman, Mrs. Dickinson, and a negro, were the only persons whose lives were spared. We regret to find the names of Col. David Crockett, Col. Jesse Benton, and Col. Bonham, of S. C. among those who perished. Gen. Bowie was murdered in his bed, sick and helpless. Gen. Cos. on finding the dead body of Col. Travis, drew his sword and mangled the face and limbs with the malignant feelings of a savage.

The bodies of the dead were thrown into a heap and burned.

The effect of these horrible atrocities upon the Texians was electrical. Every man who could use a rifle was on the march for the seat of war. It was believed that 4000 riflemen were on their way to the army, determined to abandon all other pursuits until they had exterminated the monsters. Gen. Houston was at Collorada with about 1000 men, and Col. Fannin at Goliad with 500.

New York, March 31, 1836.  
LATE FROM EUROPE.

By the packet ship *Roscoe*, Delano, master, from Liverpool, we have London papers of the 24th ult., inclusive, with Paris dates of the 22d.

The new French ministry had, after an interval of three weeks, been reorganized, with M. Thiers as President of the Council. Several of the former ministers remain; those who retire, are the Duke de Broglie, M. Guizot, and M. Persil. We do not perceive that *Humann*, though causing the change, profits by it, in the way of place.

Fieschi, and his two accomplices, Perpin and Morey, had undergone the ex-

treme penalty of the law. Mercy, it was thought and hoped, would have been extended to the drunkard guilty and gray hairs of Morey, but Louis Philippe's mercy has never yet been manifested towards political offenders. The culprits being beheaded, *Nina Lasse*, the one-eyed mistress of Fieschi, had been hired, at a considerable salary, as a *demoiselle de comptoir*, at a Parisian coffee-house.

Spanish affairs do not appear to approach a settlement. The Carlists make headway in the provinces, and Mendizabal is embarrassed at Madrid; and it is alleged in the private correspondence of the *London Morning Herald*, the new Cortez shall be ultra liberal or radical in its composition, he will be still more so. In England all seems quiet. Parliament was in full occupation, and among other matters, with railroad projects, almost as numerous as in our country. Schemes were before Parliament for railroads requiring for their completion, 45,000,000. sterling—upwards of two hundred millions of dollars.

Mme. Littitia Buonaparte, the mother of Napoleon, died at Rome on the 2d of February.

### Weekly Almanac,

APRIL.	Sun. rise sets.	Sun. rise sets.	Sun. rise sets.
15 Friday,	6 31 6 29		
16 Saturday,	5 30 6 30		
17 Sunday,	5 29 6 31		
18 Monday,	5 28 6 32		
19 Tuesday,	5 27 6 33		
20 Wednesday,	5 26 6 34		
21 Thursday,	5 25 6 35		



From the Knickerbocker.

### MY GOD DIRECTS THE STORM.

The Spirit of the Tempest shook  
His wing of raven hue  
Above the sea, and hollow winds  
Howl'd o'er the waters blue.  
  
Up rose the mountain billows high,  
And swept a stormy path;  
Darkness and terror mingled there  
Their ministry of wrath.  
  
A lonely bark, by bounding seas  
Tost wildly to and fro,  
Dash'd o'er the billow's foaming brow  
To fearful depths below.  
  
The sturdy seamen struggled hard  
To hold the yielding helm,  
And keep the ship's prow to the surge,  
That threaten'd to overwhelm.  
  
And when the plunging ruin spurn'd  
Their impotent control,  
They flew to drown their gloomy fears  
In the accursed bowl.  
  
Upon the raging ocean then  
Helpless was left the bark,  
To the wild mercy of the waves,  
Amid the tempest dark.  
  
Upon the deck, alone, there stood  
A man of courage high;  
A hero, from whose bosom fear  
Had never drawn a sigh.  
  
With folded arms, erect he stood,  
His countenance was mild;  
And, calmly gazing on the scene,  
He bow'd his head and smiled.  
  
A wild shriek from the cabin rose—  
Up rush'd his beauteous bride;  
With locks dishevel'd and in tears,  
She trembled at his side.  
  
'O why, my love, upon thy lip,'  
She cried, 'doth play that smile,  
When all is gloom and terror here,  
And I must weep the while?'  
  
No word the warrior spake—but he  
Drew from beneath his vest  
A poniard bright, and placed its point  
Against her heaving breast.  
  
She started not, nor shriek'd in dread,  
As she had shriek'd before;  
But stood astonish'd, and survey'd  
His tranquil features o'er.  
  
'Now why,' he ask'd, 'doth thou not start?  
May not thy blood be spilt?'  
With sweet composure she replied,  
'My husband holds the hill!'  
  
'Dost wonder, then, that I am calm,  
That fear shakes not my form?  
I never can tremble while I know  
My God directs the storm!'

### STORY OF THE FARMER AND THE SOLDIER.

Boys are apt to form very ridiculous notions respecting the splendour and delights of a soldier's life, which, instead of happiness as they imagine, is perhaps the most miserable in the world. While the youth of genius and industry is rising in the pursuit of his peaceful and honorable occupations, how often is his thoughtless, early companion, who has embraced the career of a soldier's life, spending his best years in the listlessness of an undeal'd range of duty, becoming old in doing nothing, and only preparing for himself, most likely, a painful conclusion to a valueless existence! Boys who are not aware of the sufferings which often accompany the soldier's career, may possibly profit by the perusal of the following little story, written by Mrs. Sigourney, an American authoress:—

It was a cold evening in winter. A lamp cast its cheerful ray from the window of a small farm house in one of the villages of New England. A fire was burning brightly on the hearth, and two brothers sat near it. Several school-books lay by them on the table, from which they had been studying their lessons for the next day. Their parents had retired to rest, and the boys were conversing earnestly. The youngest, who was about thirteen, said, 'John, I mean to be a soldier.' 'Why so, James?' 'I have been reading the life of Alexander of Macedon, and also a good deal about Napoleon Bonaparte. I think they were the greatest men that ever lived. There is nothing in this world like the glory of the warrior.'

'It does not seem to me glorious to do so much harm. To destroy multitudes of innocent men, and to make such mourning in families, and so much poverty and misery in the world, is more cruel than glorious.'

'O, but then, John, to be so honored, and to have so many soldiers under your command, and the fame of such mighty victories—what glory is there to be compared with this!'

'James, our good minister told us in his sermon last Sunday, that the end of life was the test of its goodness. Now, Alexander, that you call the great, got intoxicated and died like a madman; and Napoleon was imprisoned on a desolate

island, like a chained wild beast, for all the world to gaze and wonder at. It was necessary that he should be confined, as that a ferocious monster should be put in a cage.'

'John, your ideas are very limited. You are not capable of admiring heroes. You are just fit to be a farmer. I dare say that to break a pair of steers is your highest ambition, and to spend your days in ploughing and reaping would be glory enough for you.'

The voice of their father was now heard, calling, 'Boys, go to bed.' So ended their conversation for that night.

Fifteen years passed away, and the same season again returned. From the same window a bright lamp gleamed, and on the same hearth was a cheerful fire. The building seemed unaltered, but among its inmates there were changes. The parents who had then retired to rest, had now laid down in the deeper sleep of the grave. They were pions, and among the little circle of their native village, their memory was held in sweet remembrance.

In the same chairs which they used to occupy, were seated their eldest son and his wife. A babe lay in the cradle, and two other little ones breathed sweetly from their trundle bed in the quiet sleep of childhood.

A blast with snow came against the casement. 'I always think,' said John, 'a great deal about my poor brother at this season of the year, and especially in stormy nights. But it is now so many years since we have heard from him, and his way of life exposed him to so much danger, that I fear we have strong reason to believe him dead.' 'What a pity,' said his wife, 'that he would be a soldier!'

A faint knocking was heard at the door. It was opened, and a man entered wearily, and leaning upon crutches. His clothes were thin and tattered, and his countenance haggard. They reached him a chair and he sank into it. He gazed earnestly on each of their faces, and then on every article of furniture, as on some recollect friend. Stretching out his withered arms, he said, in a tone scarcely audible—'Brother!—brother!' The sound of that voice opened the tender remembrances of many years. They hastened to welcome the wanderer, and to mingle their tears with his.

'Brother, sister, I have come home to you to die.'

He was too much exhausted to converse, and they exerted themselves to prepare him fitting nourishment and to make him comfortable for the night. The next morning he was unable to rise. They sat by his bed and soothed his worn heart with kindness, and told him the simple narrative of all that had befallen them in their quiet abode.

'Among all my troubles,' said he, 'and I have had many, none has so bowed me down as my sin in leaving home without the knowledge of my parents, to become a soldier. When I knew it was against their will, I have felt the pain of wounds, but there is nothing like the sting of conscience. When I have lain perishing with hunger and parching with thirst, a prisoner in the enemy's hands, the image of my home and of my ingratitude, would be with me when I lay down and when I rose up. I would think I saw my mother bending tenderly over me, as she used to do when I had only a headache; and my father with the Bible in his hand, out of which he read to us in the evening before his prayer; but when I have stretched out my hands to say, "Father, I am no more worthy to be called thy son," I would awake, and it was as if I had sinned. But there would be the marks of my disobedience; and how often I have wept to think that the children of my peaceful precepts had become a stain of blood!'

His brother hastened to assure him of the perfect forgiveness of his parents, and that daily and nightly he was mentioned in their supplications as their beloved and absent erring one.

As his strength permitted, he told them the story of his wanderings and his sufferings. He had been in battles by sea and by land. He had heard the deep ocean echo with the thunders of war, and seen the earth drink in the strange red shower from mangled and palpitating bodies. He had stood in the martial lists of Europe, and jeopardized his life for a foreign power; and he had pursued in his own land the hunted Indian, flying at midnight from his flaming hut. He had gone with the bravest where dangers thickened, and had sought in every place for the glory of war, but had found only misery.

'That glory which dazzled me in my days of boyhood, and which I supposed was always the reward of the brave, continually eluded me. It is reserved for the successful leaders of armies. They alone are the heroes, while the poor soldiers by whose toil the victories are won, endure the hardship that others may reap the fame. Yet how light is all the boasted glory which was ever obtained by the greatest commander, compared with the good that he forfeits and the sorrow that he inflicts in order to obtain it!'

'Sometimes, when we were ready for a battle, and just before we rushed into it, I have felt a fearful shuddering, an inexpressible horror at the thought of butchering my fellow creatures. But in the heat of contest such feelings vanished, and the madness and desperation of

a demon possessed me. I cared neither for heaven nor hell.'

'You who dwell in the midst of the influences of energy, and shrink to give pain even to an animal, can hardly imagine what hardness of heart comes with the life of a soldier. Deeds of cruelty are always before him, and he heeds neither the sufferings of the starving infant nor the groans of its dying mother.'

'Of my own varieties of pain I will not speak. Yet when I have lain on the field of battle and unable to move from among the feet of trampling horses, when my wounds stiffened in the chilly night air and no man cared for my soul, I have thought it no more than just, since my own hand had dealt the same violence to others, perhaps inflicted even keener anguish than that which was appointed to me.'

'But the greatest evil of a soldier's life is not the hardship to which he is exposed or the wounds he may sustain, but the sin with which he is surrounded and made familiar. Oaths, imprecations, and contempt of every thing sacred, are the elements of his trade. In this hardened career, though I exerted myself to appear bold and courageous, my heart constantly misgave me. God grant that it may be purified by repentance before I am summoned to the dread bar of judgment.'

His friends flattered themselves that by medical skill and nursing he might eventually be restored to health. But he said 'It can never be. My vital energies are wasted.'

'Brother,' he would say, 'you have been a man of peace. In the quiet occupation of husbandry you have served God and loved your neighbor. You have been merciful to the animal creation. You have taken the fleece and saved the sheep alive; but I have wantonly defaced the image of God, and stopped that breath which I never can restore. You have taken the honey, and preserved the laboring bee; but I have destroyed man and his habitation, burned the hive and spilt the honey on the ground. You cannot imagine how bitter is now my sorrow for the performance of such abominations.'

He declined rapidly. Death came on with hasty strides. Laying his cold hand upon the head of the eldest little boy, who had been much around his bed in his sickness, he said, 'Dear John, never be a soldier. Sister, brother, you have been as angels of mercy to me. The blessing of the God of peace abide with you, and upon your house.'

So saying, he expired. Such was the concluding scene in the life of a being who had fondly anticipated in the soldier's career nothing but splendor and unfading glory.

### EQUITY SALES.

#### STATE OF NORTH-CAROLINA. Orange County.

By virtue of a decree of the Court of Equity, in the case of the heirs-at-law of Zachariah Herndon, deceased, on a petition to sell real estate, made at March term, 1836, I shall proceed to sell, to the highest bidder, before the court house door in the town of Hillsborough, on Monday the 23d day of May next, being the first day of Orange County Court, on a credit of one and two years, the following tracts of land:

The Homestead or Mansion House Tract,

The Rutherford Tract, and

The Jordan Tract.

JAMES WEBB, C. & M.

April 7. 13-6w

#### STATE OF NORTH-CAROLINA. Orange County.

By virtue of a decree of the Court of Equity, in the petition of Vernon Rhodes to sell land, made at March term, 1836, I shall proceed to sell, to the highest bidder, before the court house door in the town of Hillsborough, on Monday the 23d day of May next, being the first day of Orange County Court, on a credit of one and two years, A TRACT OF LAND ON THE waters of Eno, containing about 275 acres.

JAMES WEBB, C. & M.

April 7. 13-6w

### FIVE CENTS REWARD!

RAN away from the subscriber, on Sunday the 20th of March, a bound boy by the name of GREEN O'DANIEL, about eighteen years of age, full face, dark hair, stout built. All persons are forbid harbouring him, under the penalty of the law. A reward of five cents will be given for his apprehension, but no charges paid for his return.

JAMES CRUTCHFIELD.

April 1. 13-3w

### LOOK AT THIS!

I AM already called on by the Post Office Department to pay to the Contractor on this line what is due to that department. I do therefore most earnestly hope that all who are in arrears for either letter or newspaper postage, will call and pay their respective dues, as I have no other means of paying, and no indulgence will be given to me.

THOS. CLANCY, P. M.

April 1. 12-

### The Beautiful and Thorough-bred Horse

WILL stand this season at my stable—

terms made known in bills. He unites great beauty and strength, with the richest pedigree, in which is combined all the best blood both of modern and ancient times. A superior horse has at no time stood here.

A. J. DAVIE.

February 25. 08-

JAMES WEBB, C. & M.

April 7. 13-

JAMES WEBB, C. & M.